REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed February 10, 2003, has been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

Claims 1, 5, and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana. Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana and further in view of Amano. And claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana and further in view of Fujimura. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendment, claim 1 and the specification have been amended to better define the invention. Support for the amendment to the specification is clearly found in Figure 6.

To establish a *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *See* MPEP 2143.03. Amended claim 1 now requires that a sectional shape of the first lens in the X-direction and a position of each of the infrared rays emitting elements with respect to the sectional shape of the first lens are selected so that the infrared rays radiation range is expanded in the X-direction over the two convex opposing end portions of first lens. Therefore, in accordance with the claimed invention, the information is widely

transmitted so that it is possible to perform wide communication.

The Examiner contends that "Yamana et al. discloses such a plurality of elements (Yamana et al., light-emitting diode chips 2 in Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 1-2) and first lens (Yamana et al., col. 3, lines 21-36, Fig. 2) having two convex opposing end portions (Yamana et al., convex opposing end portions of cylindrical lens 4 in Fig. 1), and having a length longer than a length of the arrangement of the infrared rays emitting elements so as to expand infrared rays radiation range in the direction of the X-lin." *Office Action,* pages 2-3. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention. The light source of Yamana is provided for illuminating a linear object such as a facsimile, bar code reader and the like (col. 1, lines 7-13). The object of Yamana's invention is to provide a light source with may sufficiently use the light beam (col. 1, lines 20-23). To this end, the light beam does not expand in the X-direction as clearly shown in Figures 8 and 2 (see also col. 10, lines 46-48). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is now patentable over either Rosenberg or Yamana, taken individually or in combination.

Claims 5 and 6 are dependent from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 2 is dependent from claim 1, and since Amano does not address the shortcomings of the Rosenberg and Yamana combination, it is respectfully submitted that claim 2 is patentable over prior art for the same reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

Claim 3 is dependent from claim 1 and is patentable over prior

art for the same reasons provided in connection with claim 1.

Each issue raised in the Office Action dated February 10, 2003, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 1-3 and 5-6 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ &
DOUGHERTY

By: _____
Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 412-1155 Ext. 16